DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 246 961 JC 840 434

AUTHOR Hekimian, Shirley
TITLE Criteria for the Institutional Evaluation of Community College Staff Development Programs.
INSTITUTION Florida Univ., Gainesville. Inst. of Higher Education.
PUB DATE 84
NOTE 68p.; Appendix A may be marginally legible due to small print.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Colleges; *Evaluation Criteria; *Evaluation Methods; *Program Administration; *Program Evaluation; School Surveys; *Staff Development; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS Context Input Process Product Evaluation Model

ABSTRACT

This three-part report provides a literature review on the evaluation of community college staff development programs, reports on a study conducted to identify and validate evaluation criteria, and suggests a process for the use of these criteria in program evaluation. Part I reviews literature focusing on staff and program development, terminological considerations, special efforts in Florida's community colleges, the need for program evaluation, and evaluation and decision making. Part II presents the methodology and findings of a study which sought to: (1) identify and validate criteria for the institutional evaluation of staff and program development programs; (2) demonstrate the utility of the Stufflebeam Context-Input-Process-Product (CIPP) model of evaluation; and (3) investigate whether different groups served by staff development programs varied in their perceptions of the importance of identified evaluation criteria. Finally, part III presents a process for the utilization of the validated evaluation criteria, using a Stufflebeam CIPP framework. For each of four decision-making areas, planning (Context), procedural design (Input), program implementation (Process), and outcomes (Product), objectives and criteria are enumerated. Appendices provide the questionnaire used to validate the evaluation criteria and a list of references. (HB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
J. L. Wattenbarger

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED246961

CRITERIA FOR THE INSTITUTIONAL EVALUATION OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

by

SHIRLEY HEKIMIAN, Ph.D.

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
INSTITUTE OF HIGHER EDUCATION

GAINESVILLE, FLORIDA

1984

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
INTRODUCTION		iv
AN OVERVIEW		v
PART I	EVALUATION OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS	1
	Introduction	1
	Staff and Program Development	3
	A Question of Terminology	5
	The Florida Plan	6
	The Need for Evaluation	8
	Evaluation and Decision Making	12
PART II	THE STUDY	14
	METHODOLOGY	15
	RESULTS	17
	Internal Consistency and Item Correlation	23
	Results of a Two-Way Factorial Multivariate Analysis of Variance	28
	Over-all Position Effect	30
	Over-all Status Effect	30
	Over-all Position and Status Effect	30
	Multivariate Simple Main Effects	31
	Univariate Results	32
	Post-Hoc Comparisons	33
	Conclusions	34
	Discussion	36
	Recommendations	39
	Implications	40
PART III	A PROCESS FOR UTILIZATION	41
	Context Evaluation	41
	Input Evaluation	42
	Process Evaluation	44
	Product Evaluation	47
APPENDIX A - STUDY COVER LETTER AND QUESTIONNAIRE		52
REFERENCES		60

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Population and Sample Sizes	18
2.	Overall Item Means, Standard Deviations, Minimum and Maximum Values, and Percentage Ratings	20
3.	Overall Group Data on CIPP Categories	24
4.	Criterion Item-Subtest Correlations	25
5.	Cell Means and Standard Deviations for the Two-Way Factorial Multivariate Design . . .	29
6.	Summary of the Four One-Way Analyses of Variance for Position Type on CIPP Subscores for Part-Time Employees	32
7.	Contrasts of Mean Differences Among Three Position Levels for Part-Time Status in the Input Criterion Category	33

INTRODUCTION

The Institute of Higher Education as a research and service agency of the University of Florida provides occasional reports and studies designed to promote improvement in community college operation, to identify knowledge which will support institutional development and/or improvement, and to support inquiry which is a basis for development of quality in the community college or university.

Previous studies have followed these precepts. This report is also in that tradition. No other area in relation to higher education has received more emphasis during the 1980s than staff and program development; however, little focus has been provided for evaluating such programs.

Dr. Hekimian has analyzed with thoroughness the process as well as the product of evaluation. That process (and product) are described in this report as related to staff and program development. Her instrument is presented herein in hopes that colleges will use it in developing their own processes of evaluation for staff and program development.

The IHE is pleased to add this to the series on contributions to higher education. The reactions of users are always welcomed.

James L. Wattenbarger

Gainesville, Florida
September, 1984

AN OVERVIEW

Approaches to evaluation such as who is to be evaluated, what is to be evaluated, and how evaluation should be developed and implemented have changed dramatically over the years. Although evaluation in postsecondary education has not resulted in precise measures for program assessment, this lack of precision should not be interpreted as a lack of need. Increased accountability demands have forced institutions of higher education to look closely at their programs. Community college staff development programs have been no exception. Since the early 1970s, significant effort has been directed toward the development and implementation of these programs. Yet little is known about their effectiveness.

This investigation identified and validated criteria for the institutional evaluation of community college staff development programs and provided a process for their use. The findings demonstrated that the Stufflebeam Context-Input-Process-Product model of evaluation served as an appropriate framework for grouping the criteria. Depending upon the type of decision making to be served: planning (Context), structuring (Input), implementing (Process) or recycling (Product), these criteria were considered important by multiple decision-making sources at the local, state and national level. Moreover, the majority of respondents fro

selected program publics at the institutional level demonstrated consensus with the experts by rating each criterion no less than above average in importance. The findings further suggested that evaluation was critical to good staff development programs and that selected program publics could be successfully utilized in determining a program's standards for evaluation.

PART I
EVALUATION OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Introduction

The two terms most often used when describing educational programs are accountability and quality. Each involves judgment and a concern for the effectiveness of educational products and processes. Educators have increasingly focused on outcomes of higher education in an attempt to correct the deficiencies caused by the rapid educational expansion of the fifties and sixties. As a result, educational program evaluation has evolved as a systematic means of assisting an institution in the planning and assessment of its programs and services.

Community colleges, the most recent phenomena in higher education, have been no exception in taking stock of their program offerings. In the past, their active involvement in new program development often kept them from specific inquiries regarding the success of their programs. However, this is no longer the case. Presently, both local institutions and state agencies are involving themselves in efforts to identify criteria for the evaluation of existing programs (Day & Bender, 1976).

Unlike the research orientation of four-year colleges and universities, community colleges typically have been known as teaching institutions. "Community-junior colleges seek not communities of scholars, but rather communities of

learners" (O'Banion, 1972, p. 20). This emphasis upon teaching placed an added responsibility upon staff to remain current in their fields, and knowledgeable in the new technologies.

> The staff is the heart of the operation of schools. Money, materials, time, space, facilities, and curricula--all these are important, too. But initially, in process and ultimately, the ability of the staff to perform is crucial. (Harris, 1980, p. 13)

Without a competent faculty and staff, the concepts of accountability and quality have little meaning.

> The heavy reliance upon people to perform nearly all tasks required for building and maintaining quality educational programs is a reality that cannot be treated lightly. It is this reality that gives in-service education both its importance and its urgency. (Harris, 1980, p. 13)

Griffin (1978) emphasized that one of the requirements of a profession is that its members continue to grow in order that their clients receive the best skills and knowledge available to them.

Florida has made a system-wide commitment toward improvement by providing funds for staff and program development in the community colleges. As a result, each of Florida's twenty-eight community colleges has a formal staff and program development plan. Little attention, however, has been given to assessing the outcomes of these programs or to evaluating how well they accomplish their purpose. Formulation and validation of appropriate criteria for evaluation of staff development programs in the community

college setting is of critical importance in maintaining accountability for Florida's landmark program.

Staff and Program Development

During the decades of the 1950s and 1960s, the focus in education was on student development. High enrollments and increased access to higher education created new institutions, new programs and innovative curricular offerings.

This period was followed by one which focused on faculty development. Interest was promoted by the extensive growth of professional literature on the subject. The Group for Human Development in Higher Education in their 1974 publication, Faculty Development in a Time of Retrenchment, helped foster this interest along with other leaders in the field such as Jerry Gaff (1975), Toward Faculty Renewal; and Bergquist and Phillips (1975), A Handbook for Faculty Development. The 1970s represented diminishing yet diverse student enrollments as more and more adults returned to school. Institutions responded ineffectively by attempting either to increase or to change curriculum offerings. As a result, changing enrollment patterns caused surplus faculty in some fields and insufficient faculty in others. As the decade ended, it became increasingly apparent that due to poor job mobility, faculties were becoming "tenured in," and institutions could no longer hire as many new Ph.D.s as they did in the past (Gaff & Justice, 1978). Institutions began

looking at ways to change their staff in order ultimately to change their institutional climate and programs.

The American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC) declared staff development "top priority" in 1973. "Staff development was heralded as a means by which community colleges could respond to the heavy demands brought by the advent of new students, changes in instructional technologies, and the pressing need for institutional resilience" (Case, 1978, p. 131). The National Council for Staff, Program and Organization Development (NCSPOD) was formed in October, 1977, and was formally approved in January of 1978, as an affiliate council of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

John Centra's national survey in 1976 indicated that over half the institutions of higher education in this country have faculty development programs. However, the approaches to faculty development ranged from the traditional, upgrading knowledge of subject matter to the more progressive, such as teaching effectiveness, personal enrichment, and career enhancement.

Major funding sources, both private and public, provided money to institutions of higher education for experiments in faculty development. Among the earliest were The Danforth Foundation, the Lilly Endowment, the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, and the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (Jalbert, 1980).

The need to revitalize faculties and institutions has been recognized by educational leaders nationwide. According to Secretary of Education, Terrel H. Bell:

> There has never been a time in the history of American Education when inservice training was more necessary than it is now. Local and State education agencies have to find some way, in spite of all their budget pressures, to target more resources into the improvement of the quality of teaching. (Inservice, 1981, p. 1)

The need for professionals to be involved in a continuing process of educational renewal has long been recognized as an essential ingredient to competence.

The 1973 report of the Assembly of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, titled New Staff for New Students stated:

> In economic terms, the staff is the college's most significant and largest capital investment. In these terms alone, we affirm that it is only good sense that the investment should be helped to appreciate in value and not be allowed to wear itself out or slide into obsolescence by inattention or neglect. (Yarrington, 1974, p. 139)

A Question of Terminology

In the literature on staff and program development different terms have been used to describe similar programs. Among the widely used terms were continuing education, faculty development, in-service education, on-the-job training, professional development, professional growth, and renewal. To add to the confusion, program development typically was a component of most staff development programs except in Florida where it was distinguished separately and received equal billing. The reader should note that

throughout this investigation when the term staff development is used alone, it includes program development unless otherwise stated.

The Florida Plan

Staff and program development in Florida's community colleges provides professional and personal development activities to all college employees. The plan was established by an act of the Florida Legislature in 1968. Chapter 230.767, Section 2, Parts (d) and (e), of the Florida Statutes designated that beginning July 1, 1968, the amounts allocated for salaries would be increased by three percent and beginning July 1, 1969, and thereafter, the percentage would be increased to five percent in order to provide funding for staff and program development to Florida's public community colleges. Once the law was enacted, however, the legislature maintained the level of funding at three percent rather than the five percent as originally proposed (Official Florida Statutes, 1971).

Once funding was determined, the Commissioner of Education through the Division of Community Colleges was responsible for implementing the Staff and Program Development Plan. Subsequently, the following regulations were developed:

> Funds included in the Minimum Foundation Program for Staff and Program Development shall be expended by each junior college in accordance with a plan for staff and program development. Such plan shall be annually reviewed, evaluated and modified as necessary by each college. Such plans

> shall be submitted for review and approved as required by the State Superintendent. (Department of Education, 1968, p. 143)

In order to determine staff and program development needs, the President's Council Committee made up of six community-junior college presidents identified the following goals which were to be emphasized in the State of Florida Staff and Program Development Plan:

1. Advancement of the college, the individual, and the community.
2. Facilitation of recruitment and retention of able faculty.
3. Provision for incentive and means for college personnel to continue their education.
4. Increase of faculty skills, thereby benefitting students.
5. Enhancement of the public image of the college both locally and within academic circles.
6. Maintaining of standards of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. (Division of Community Colleges, 1968, p. 1)

The President's Council Committee also recommended that a balance exist between faculty and program development at each institution. These recommendations were approved, and Florida's commitment to staff and program development had been established. Official state guidelines subsequently were provided by the Division of Community Colleges.

In response to the need for closer ties among program coordinators, the Florida Committee for Staff and Program Development was formed in September 1975. The Committee later became the Florida Association for Staff and Program Development which remains active today in promoting staff and program development practices in Florida's community colleges (Terrell, 1978).

On July 1, 1973, State Board of Education Rule 6A-14.29 became effective which amended the state's allocation for staff and program development to 2% of the institution's previous year's operating budget. The amendment provided both authority and a funding formula and removed the authorization for staff and program development from law (Department of Education, 1977).

The Need for Evaluation

Although much attention has been given to the planning and implementation of staff development programs, little attention has been given to their evaluation (O'Banion, 1978; Smith, 1977; Watts & Hammons, 1980). Centra's (1976) national study found that of the 326 two-year colleges reporting only 19% had done a fairly thorough evaluation, 35% had done a partial evaluation, and 42% had done no evaluation at all. Smith (1980), under the sponsorship of the National Council for Staff, Program, and Organizational Development, replicated and expanded the Centra study to find that a lack of program evaluation continued to exist three years later. Of the 413 two-year colleges reporting, only 25% had done a complete evaluation of their programs. Similar to the Centra study, 42% of the colleges reported that they were not involved in any type of evaluation effort.

In Florida, the Division of Community Colleges organized an evaluation plan for staff and program development

activities. The Division required the following information on each activity: title of the project, specific objectives stated in performance terms, program planning budgetary system, and amounts budgeted and spent on the activity. In addition, the director had to report on whether the objectives for the activity were met, and whether the activity was ever started, abandoned, still in progress, or complete. A narrative evaluation was required which described the results of the project and how these results related to the college's five-year goal plan for staff and program development. Although the plan included some components of goal-based evaluation, it relied too heavily on subjective assessment. The reporting system was burdensome and only one standardized format was used which seriously limited experimentation with other methods of evaluation (O'Banion, 1978; Smith, 1977). As a result, State Board of Education rule 6A-14.29 was amended on July 6, 1982, and the requirement for reporting was deleted (Department of Education, 1982).

Currently, a system-wide process of evaluation for staff and program development in Florida's community colleges does not exist. As a result, institutions are responsible for the evaluation of their respective programs.

From the academic years 1969-70 through 1979-80, Florida spent over 30 million dollars on staff and program development in its community colleges (Department of Education, 1980). To date, it has not been determined whether

these programs have accomplished their purpose. Wergin (1977) stated that "it seems only fair that an enterprise spawned in large measure by the accountability movement should itself be held accountable" (p. 58).

Institutions have demonstrated a need for direction by creating hierarchies of missions, goals and objectives. Efforts have been less successful in the formulation of indicators which serve as criteria of institutional goals and objectives. "Effective management and evaluation in higher education are directly dependent upon the development and use of adequate criteria for student performance, program success, and institutional viability" (Fincher, 1978, p. 2). The development of criteria and defending the specification on which they are based is difficult because values are inherently implied (Stufflebeam et al., 1971).

> Nevertheless, the process of developing criteria helps sensitize people to the issues involved and the salient features that they must consider in evaluation, even though the final product will require wise judgement rather than a summary of criteria met and unmet. In short, one should go through a process of developing criteria that encourages widespread institutional participation, but should not allow this stage to dominate the process. (Petrie, 1982, p. 23-24)

Bergquist and Phillips (1977) recommended that criteria be determined when measuring the success of faculty development programs particularly as these criteria relate to program goals, priorities, values, and objectives. Smith (1977) considered the establishment of goals and standards as the most important step in implementing staff development evaluation.

A joint study conducted in 1979 by Lilla Engdahl for the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE) and Robert Barak for the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS) found that the selection of criteria to be one of the most critical aspects of program review. Participants surveyed in approximately one third of the country's postsecondary institutions expressed a need for criteria in the assessments of program quality and productivity (Engdahl & Barak, 1980). Alden (1978) suggested that minimum criteria be established before any data are collected. Management should be involved in both defining criteria and committing themselves to their use in the decision making process. Fincher (1978) concurred that criteria should be available at the time decisions are made regarding program success.

Criteria provide both a framework within which evidence is collected, and a direction toward the types of information sought. Thus, selection of appropriate criteria is vital for sound decision making. It is essential that criteria are trusted by all decision makers particularly where multiple decision makers are involved (Steele, 1970). Barak (1982) recommended that participants be meaningfully involved in the review process. Criteria should be generated and assessed by multiple sources, such as students, faculty, alumni and peers. Yet, little is known about the extent to which such program publics would agree or differ

in their perceptions of the importance of such multiple criteria.

Evaluation and Decision Making

Most writers on program evaluation speak of the process as a tool for decision making. Anderson and Ball (1978) mentioned decision making as the common element in most writings of those identified with the field. The assumption with this evaluation approach is that information flows to a single manager who, in effect, has the control to reach a particular decision and act on it. In reality, however, this is not the case. "Most action is determined by a pluralistic community not by a lone decision maker" (Cronbach, 1982, p. 5).

Understanding that evaluation does not, generally, serve a lone decision maker, Stufflebeam et al. (1971) maintained that evaluation should be instrumental in solving problems relative to decision making. The scope of these problems can be understood by evaluators in the following ways:

> At a minimum, they know who the decision makers are, what decision questions they must answer, what decision alternatives are to be considered, what criteria are to be used in judging the alternatives, and the projected timing of the steps in the decision process. They must know these things well in advance of when the decisions are to be made. Without adequate foreknowledge, evaluators can neither determine nor meet the information requirements of decision makers and evaluation studies must depend upon factors of chance. (p. 49)

Stufflebeam et al. (1971) identified four major stages in the process of decision making: awareness, design, choice, and action. These occur in four settings represented by the intersection of two continua: small vs. large educational change and high vs. low information grasp. Decision making models were developed from this formulation in relation to the decision setting employed.

The concern for decisions led Stufflebeam and associates to analyze decision types which included: planning decisions, structuring decisions, implementing decisions, and recycling decisions. These decision types were represented by intersecting an end-means dimension with an intended-actual dimension.

> Context evaluation serves planning decisions to determine objectives; input evaluation serves structuring decisions to determine project designs; process evaluation serves implementing decisions to control project operations; and product evaluation serves recycling decisions to judge and react to project attainments. (Stufflebeam et al., 1971, p. 218)

This formed the basis of the Context-Input-Process-Product-Model (CIPP) which was developed by the Phi Delta Kappa National Study Committee of Evaluation in 1971 under the Chairmanship of Daniel Stufflebeam (Stufflebeam et al., 1971; Guba & Lincoln, 1981). A major premise underlying the present study was that this CIPP model could provide a useful theoretical framework for formulating criteria for evaluating community college staff development programs.

PART II

THE STUDY

The purpose of this investigation was (1) to identify and validate criteria for the institutional evaluation of staff and program development programs with special reference to Florida public community colleges; (2) to demonstrate the utility of the Stufflebeam Context-Input-Process-Product model of evaluation for categorizing these criteria for different types of decision-making; and (3) to investigate whether different program publics served by the staff development program differed in their perceptions of the importance of criteria in the four categories. Empirical validation of the criteria and their placement within specific categories of the CIPP model framework involved three questions:

1. Were the identified criteria rated as "important" by a sample of the program publics served by the staff development program?
2. Did the mean perceived importance ratings of each criterion correlate with the total score for that CIPP category in which it was placed (i.e., did respondents consistently value criteria grouped together by the CIPP framework)?
3. Were there differences among selected program publics in their perceived value of the four

criterion categories (i.e., administration, faculty, and career service personnel)?

The investigation of the third question above involved testing the following statistical hypotheses at the .05 level of significance:

1. There is no difference among administrators, faculty and career personnel in terms of mean perceived importance ratings taking the set of CIPP subscores as a vector of dependent variables.

2. There is no difference between full-time and part-time employees in terms of mean perceived importance ratings taking the set of CIPP subscores as a vector of dependent variables.

3. There is no interaction effect between type of employee and full-time or part-time status on the vector of dependent variables.

METHODOLOGY

The investigation began with an informal telephone survey of Florida's twenty-eight community college staff and program development directors. Each was asked to describe the type of information needed if an evaluation of their program were to be conducted. Needs varied from the number of program participants to the effects the program had on the institution. The results reflected a lack of uniformity in perceptions regarding staff development program evaluation. The findings, also, reinforced the need for the study and provided a basis for the formulation of the staff development evaluative criteria.

Evaluative criteria were identified on the basis of recurring themes in the literature. Special attention was given to existing criteria developed by the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (1981) in the area of general program evaluation and by O'Connell and Meeth (1978), Day (1980), and Titlow (1981) in the area of staff development. Their validation involved a ten-member Task Force of the Florida Association for Staff and Program Development and a five-member national panel of experts. Those serving on the National panel were Dr. James Hammons, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (on leave--University of Arkansas); Dr. Eileen Kuhns, Catholic University; Dr. Terry O'Banion, League for Innovation in Community Colleges; Dr. John Roueche, The University of Texas at Austin, and Dr. Gordon Watts, Westark Community College. In addition, the criteria were organized into the CIPP evaluation framework and reviewed for correct placement by Dr. Linda Crocker, a University of Florida professor of program evaluation, and the theorist, Dr. Daniel Stufflebeam.

A questionnaire consisting of these validated criteria was pilot tested, field tested, and distributed to a stratified random sample of 360 staff members of Florida Junior College at Jacksonville during the two-phase data collection and analysis (See Appendix A). As indicated in Table 1, the target population totaled 2,645 employees. Subgroup sample size ranged from 2% to 44% of the population and included

Table 1

Population and Sample Sizes

Florida Junior College (1983-84)

Position	Status	Population	Sample Size	Percentage of Population
Administrators	Full-Time	94	30	32%
	Part-Time	57	30	44%
Faculty	Full-Time	385	30	19%
	Part-Time	1374	30	2%
Career Personnel	Full-Time	584	30	5%
	Part-Time	151	30	20%

Note: Subgroup samples were drawn during the Fall of 1983 with the exception of part-time faculty which was drawn in February, 1984.

full-time and part-time administrators, faculty, and career service personnel.

This study was designed according to a two-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA). The first factor, position, involved three levels: administrators, faculty and career service personnel. The second factor, status, involved two levels: full-time and part-time. Each subject was observed on a vector of dependent variables (CIPP subscores). The focus of the analysis involved testing three null hypotheses at the .05 level of significance.

RESULTS

This study identified a list of criteria which were hypothesized to have potential usefulness in the evaluation of community college staff development programs. In an empirical validation of these criteria on a sample of selected program publics served by this program, the following questions were addressed:

1. Were the identified criteria rated as "important" by respondents in the sample?
2. When criteria were grouped into categories using the CIPP evaluation model, did the mean importance rating for each item correlate significantly with the total score for other items in that same category?

3. Were there differences among administrators, faculty, and career service personnel in the importance which they attached to these criteria?

The first stage of the investigation involved a field test of the instrument where one hundred eighty staff members of Florida Junior College at Jacksonville were surveyed (see Table 1). A response rate of 31% without a follow-up of nonrespondents provided data for the resultant item analysis. Descriptive statistical data were utilized (i.e., mean, standard deviation, Pearson-product moment correlation) to provide information concerning overall perceptions on each item and categories of items (CIPP). In addition, aberrant response patterns were assessed and the suitability of criteria placement in the CIPP categories was determined. Based upon the findings, selected criteria were re-worded, placed in another CIPP category, or omitted.

Replicating the sub-group populations and sample size of the field test (see Table 1), the second stage of the investigation involved surveying an additional 180 staff members from Florida Junior College. The 82 item questionnaire produced a response rate of 55% after a two phase follow-up of nonrespondents. Table 2 includes the over-all mean, standard deviation, minimum value, maximum value, and the percentage of respondents who rated each criterion either 1 or 2 (i.e., Very Important = 1, Above Average Importance = 2) for all items. From these descriptive data,

Table 2

Overall Item Means, Standard Deviations, Minimum and Maximum Values, and Percentage Ratings

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min. Value	Max. Value	Respondents Rating 1 or 2
1	1.3232	0.7118	1.00	5.00	.90
2	1.3737	0.7366	1.00	5.00	.89
2A	1.4242	0.7966	1.00	5.00	.89
2B	1.5051	0.7610	1.00	5.00	.90
3	1.8586	1.0401	1.00	5.00	.75
4	1.5051	0.7196	1.00	4.00	.88
5	1.9091	0.9157	1.00	5.00	.75
6	1.7677	0.7802	1.00	4.00	.79
7	1.5758	0.7705	1.00	4.00	.86
8	2.1111	1.0680	1.00	5.00	.66
9	2.3333	1.1693	1.00	5.00	.59
10	2.1919	1.0755	1.00	5.00	.69
11	2.0808	0.8998	1.00	5.00	.67
12	1.8283	0.8811	1.00	4.00	.72
13	1.7677	0.8786	1.00	5.00	.78
13A	1.9596	1.0490	1.00	5.00	.67
13B	1.8182	1.0037	1.00	5.00	.73
13C	1.9192	1.0069	1.00	5.00	.73
13D	2.0101	1.0546	1.00	5.00	.68
14	2.0909	0.9486	1.00	5.00	.63
15	1.9798	0.8327	1.00	4.00	.67
16	2.0000	1.0400	1.00	5.00	.70
17A	2.0707	1.1362	1.00	5.00	.61
17B	2.3232	1.1938	1.00	5.00	.51

Table 2

Continued

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min. Value	Max. Value	Respondents Rating 1 or 2
17C	1.9293	0.9503	1.00	4.00	.66
17D	1.8182	0.8495	1.00	4.00	.72
18	1.6869	0.7235	1.00	4.00	.87
19	1.7677	0.8309	1.00	5.00	.82
20	2.0909	0.9803	1.00	4.00	.62
21	2.3232	1.2923	1.00	5.00	.59
22	1.5960	0.7682	1.00	3.00	.83
23	1.9596	0.8442	1.00	4.00	.71
23A	2.0000	0.8690	1.00	5.00	.72
23B	1.7777	0.8025	1.00	4.00	.81
24A	1.6364	0.7348	1.00	4.00	.89
24B	1.8182	0.9622	1.00	5.00	.81
24C	1.8586	0.9148	1.00	4.00	.73
24D	1.9394	0.9564	1.00	4.00	.72
24E	1.9495	0.9728	1.00	5.00	.75
24F	1.8888	0.9571	1.00	5.00	.75
25A	2.1010	0.9636	1.00	5.00	.65
25B	2.1212	0.9505	1.00	5.00	.65
25C	2.1818	1.0338	1.00	5.00	.68
25D	2.2626	1.0746	1.00	5.00	.65
25E	2.4646	1.2064	1.00	5.00	.51
26A	2.1818	1.0338	1.00	5.00	.63
26B	1.9495	0.9299	1.00	5.00	.76
26C	2.2929	1.0619	1.00	5.00	.60
27A	1.9192	0.8998	1.00	4.00	.72
27B	2.1515	1.0338	1.00	5.00	.61

Table 2

Continued

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min. Value	Max. Value	Respondents Rating 1 or 2
27C	2.1010	1.0251	1.00	5.00	.65
27D	2.2323	1.1233	1.00	5.00	.59
27E	2.1717	1.1161	1.00	5.00	.62
28A	2.0000	0.8571	1.00	4.00	.70
28B	1.9899	0.9636	1.00	5.00	.68
28C	1.8788	0.8240	1.00	4.00	.78
29	1.7071	0.7593	1.00	4.00	.84
29A	1.9798	0.9474	1.00	5.00	.72
29B	1.8384	0.8416	1.00	4.00	.76
29C	1.6364	0.8506	1.00	4.00	.82
30	1.7879	0.8116	1.00	4.00	.80
31A	2.0303	0.9308	1.00	4.00	.68
31B	2.0808	0.9655	1.00	4.00	.66
31C	2.1212	0.9612	1.00	4.00	.68
31D	2.0101	0.9422	1.00	4.00	.70
31E	2.1010	1.0449	1.00	5.00	.64
31F	2.0101	0.9422	1.00	5.00	.69
31G	1.9899	0.8863	1.00	4.00	.70
32A	1.9798	0.8569	1.00	4.00	.73
32B	1.9394	0.9456	1.00	5.00	.75
32C	1.8283	0.9480	1.00	5.00	.81
33A	2.1111	1.0090	1.00	5.00	.67
33B	1.6869	0.8765	1.00	5.00	.82
33C	2.2525	0.9830	1.00	5.00	.59

Table 2

Continued

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min. Value	Max. Value	Respondents Rating 1 or 2
33D	2.1010	0.9741	1.00	5.00	.71
33E	1.8687	0.9545	1.00	5.00	.80
34A	1.6465	0.7994	1.00	4.00	.89
34B	1.6162	0.8536	1.00	4.00	.86
34C	1.6566	0.8350	1.00	4.00	.83
34D	1.8788	0.8363	1.00	4.00	.77
34E	2.0000	0.9689	1.00	5.00	.72
34F	1.7576	0.8817	1.00	4.00	.81

it is apparent that all criteria were regarded important by a majority of respondents.

Internal Consistency and Item Correlations

The internal consistency of the questionnaire's CIPP categories was determined by Cronbach's coefficient alpha reliability estimate. Table 3 represents the overall mean, standard deviation, standard error of the mean and variance for each CIPP category. The reliability coefficients were: Context = .8417, Input = .8469, Process = .9434 and Product = .9639.

Table 3

Overall Group Data on CIPP Categories

Category	Number of Items	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error of Mean	Variance
Context	9	1.5825	0.5395	0.5422	0.2910
Input	17	2.0137	0.5486	0.0551	0.3010
Process	27	2.0157	0.6248	0.0628	0.3904
Product	29	1.9133	0.6435	0.0647	0.4141

Note: The following numerical values were assigned to each response category: Very Important = 1; Above Average Importance = 2; Average Importance = 3; Below Average Importance = 4; Unimportant = 5. Because number of items varied in CIPP subtests, the subtest score was divided by the number of items in each subtest to control for differences in length.

Pearson product-moment correlations determined each criterion's appropriateness to the CIPP category in which it was placed. Where missing values existed, they were replaced with the overall group mean score for that particular item. The correlations are presented in Table 4, where the block of criteria which comprised a CIPP category is shown by the solid black lines.

Table 4

Criterion Item-Subtest Correlations

Item No.	Subscore Context	Input	Process	Product
1	.75360	.29292	.18475	.18626
2	.74478	.29471	.25235	.29548
2A	.71190	.37807	.23933	.27088
2B	.74261	.41753	.35912	.40076
3	.69387	.35582	.36517	.45670
4	.59252	.25146	.24442	.27411
5	.57418	.39320	.37440	.42593
6	.67767	.48850	.41690	.48014
7	.56511	.46258	.34762	.29262
8	.29781	.55368	.21541	.22919
9	.14738	.38769	.19656	.28897
10	.40910	.54386	.40997	.49252
11	.37617	.68595	.45145	.45761
12	.37478	.61090	.47726	.38303
13	.61133	.70899	.43904	.43694
13A	.50082	.71858	.45016	.43155
13B	.55565	.68587	.40596	.42530
13C	.37559	.57687	.53729	.53916
13D	.42002	.49154	.38691	.41763
14	.32086	.62276	.51279	.47763
15	.45803	.64573	.61003	.57449
16	.16571	.48499	.34779	.37958
17A	.08380	.44527	.10862	.13119
17B	.01014	.38730	.04734	.01396
17C	.11875	.48774	.26794	.19412
17D	.09243	.36730	.36144	.27014
18	.31233	.32698	.56281	.42325
19	.12287	.24538	.36090	.31662
20	.18184	.44857	.49372	.37516

Table 4
Continued

Item No.	Subscore			
	Context	Input	Process	Product
21	.14676	.30020	.42473	.34630
22	.29736	.31375	.35113	.32482
23	.51776	.53261	.71200	.66190
23A	.31925	.51876	.54294	.48450
23B	.37800	.52235	.53993	.53530
24A	.28811	.53066	.65303	.55397
24B	.36557	.49942	.63156	.54708
24C	.40982	.48707	.73386	.63698
24D	.41413	.55646	.80989	.67342
24E	.37420	.56253	.81272	.67412
24F	.41427	.55049	.80364	.71883
25A	.29353	.41069	.73807	.68952
25B	.22351	.41924	.71710	.65355
25C	.19647	.34485	.63507	.55603
25D	.20280	.30744	.68387	.63162
25E	.25583	.38846	.67361	.56141
26A	.20257	.43799	.65262	.54440
26B	.39372	.30375	.61605	.50531
26C	.31463	.48661	.66229	.54782
27A	.36421	.38527	.74976	.67013
27B	.34839	.41545	.68555	.64883
27C	.31690	.35507	.73091	.68864
27D	.29828	.38246	.70446	.67602
27E	.33871	.36080	.70712	.66759
28A	.17409	.44677	.42482	.51988
28B	.21428	.29890	.44659	.52686
28C	.38489	.41664	.56601	.66473

Table 4

Continued

Item No.	Subscore Context	Input	Process	Product
29	.45954	.44343	.61441	.69779
29A	.41591	.42323	.59239	.69773
29B	.50663	.47675	.60931	.71253
29C	.52065	.39922	.45173	.62058
30	.30064	.40025	.42998	.58357
31A	.49057	.51756	.59831	.69874
31B	.40937	.61438	.71144	.74589
31C	.42000	.62289	.74060	.80784
31D	.38983	.50839	.69759	.80813
31E	.47384	.57770	.70727	.80647
31F	.40768	.53626	.66421	.81219
31G	.30883	.56072	.63085	.72883
32A	.38871	.44111	.58295	.70505
32B	.31660	.45401	.61760	.72038
32C	.27737	.47774	.59541	.71298
33A	.30479	.46675	.65121	.68746
33B	.37528	.35227	.64533	.70552
33C	.33556	.42543	.61560	.64852
33D	.49963	.50060	.69531	.73988
33E	.33720	.33587	.72525	.76487
34A	.36408	.43406	.71795	.76192
34B	.33781	.42147	.63922	.71636
34C	.32279	.38250	.63997	.72260
34D	.40687	.35819	.69149	.73014
34E	.30151	.48897	.67485	.74489
34F	.31898	.44622	.72458	.78177

The results indicated that each criterion showed a stronger positive relationship to the subscore for the category in which it was placed than to the subscore for any other category. Those criteria showing a strong secondary relationship to another category were input items 13C, 15, 17D, process items 22, 23A, 23B, 27B, 27D, 27E, and product items 33C, 33D, 33E, 34A, and 34D. Items in the context category correlated higher to the total subscore for their category than did items in the other CIPP categories.

Results of a Two-Way Factorial Multivariate Analysis of Variance

A two-way factorial multivariate design involving 99 respondents was analyzed by a SAS multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) computer program. The first factor, position, had three levels: administrators, faculty, and career service personnel. The second factor, status, had two levels: full-time and part-time. A vector of four dependent variables included context, input, process, and product sub-scores. Some descriptive data analysis was also performed. Cell means and standard deviations for all subgroup combinations are reported in Table 5. Three null hypotheses relating to the effects of position and status on the mean perceived importance ratings of evaluative criteria for the four program criterion areas (i.e., the mean importance rating for context, input, process, and product subscores) were tested at the .05 level of significance.

Table 5

Cell Means and Standard Deviations for the Two Way Factorial Multivariate Design

Group	N	Context	Input	Process	Product
Admin	26	1.50855	2.01131	2.00285	1.94164
Full-Time		0.38640	0.54880	0.57166	0.60105
Admin	10	1.32222	1.75882	1.67407	1.57586
Part-Time		0.49815	0.44407	0.53410	0.58339
Faculty	23	1.53140	2.02813	2.19324	2.12144
Full-Time		0.47135	0.53100	0.69241	0.65280
Faculty	17	1.78431	2.05190	2.20044	1.94929
Part-Time		0.73543	0.53100	0.69241	0.65280
Career Serv.	14	1.67460	1.83193	1.75132	1.64286
Full-Time		0.63823	0.55511	0.47596	0.45699
Career Serv.	9	1.69136	2.47712	2.04115	2.02682
Part-Time		0.48995	0.53627	0.68078	0.77371

Note: Because number of items varied in CIPP subtests, the subtest score was divided by the number of items in each subtest to control for differences in length.

Overall Position Effect

HO_1: There is no difference among administrators, faculty and career service personnel in terms of mean perceived importance ratings taking the set of CIPP subscores as a vector of dependent variables.

Applying the multivariate analysis of variance resulted in rejecting the null hypothesis for the overall main effect of position. The multivariate F-ratio was found significant, $F(8,180)=1.99$, with its associated Wilks' Criterion of .8439 and a p value of .0497.

Overall Status Effect

HO_2: There is no difference between full-time and part-time employees in terms of mean perceived importance ratings taking the set of CIPP subscores as a vector of dependent variables.

The findings resulted in accepting the null hypothesis for the overall main effect of status. The F-ratio was found not to be significant, $F(4,90)=.90$, with its associated Wilks' Criterion of .9617 and p value of .4701.

Overall Position and Status Effect

HO_3: There is no interaction effect between type of employee and full-time or part-time status on the vector of CIPP dependent variables.

The null hypothesis for the overall interaction effect between position and status was rejected. The F-ratio was found significant, $F(8,180)=2.45$, with its associated Wilks' Criterion of .8132. The p value of .0153 was substantially lower than the alpha level of .05 required to reject the null hypothesis.

The presence of a sizable and significant interaction indicated that the F-tests involving the overall main effects for position and status could not be interpreted directly. Since the interaction demonstrated that some variability among the cell means was not fully attributable to the two independent variables, the analysis proceeded with tests of simple main effects (Keppel, 1982; Kirk, 1968).

Multivariate Simple Main Effects

The nature of the interaction between position and status was explored with simple main effects hypothesis tests. A separate one-way MANOVA was conducted for full-time and part-time personnel. The findings revealed no overall position effect for full-time status. The multivariate F-ratio was found not to be significant, $F(8,114)=1.37$, with its associated Wilks' Criterion of .8318 and p value of .2153. For part-time employees, however, there was an overall position effect. The F-ratio was significant, $F(8,60)=2.28$ with a Wilks' Criterion of .5885 and p value of .0337. The results suggested that among part-time employees there was a significant difference in perceptions held by administrators, faculty, and career service employees. The differences among these three groups were further investigated by four separate one-way analyses of variance (ANOVA) with three levels of position as the

independent variable and each CIPP subscore as the dependent variable.

Univariate Results

The findings of four posteriori one-way analyses of variance showed a significant F-ratio for part-time employees in the input criterion category of 4.73 at 2 and 33 degrees of freedom with an associated p value of .0156. The differences in perception among part-time employees in the context, process, and product criterion categories were not statistically significant. Univariate results are reported in Table 6.

Table 6

Summary of the Four One-Way Analyses of Variance for Position Type on CIPP Subscores for Part-Time Employees

Dependent Variable	Source	Type IV SS	df	Mean Square	F	PR > F
Context	Position Type	1.3857	2	.6929	1.79	.1836
	Error (within)		33			
Input	Position Type	2.4640	2	1.2320	4.73	.0156*
	Error (within)		33			
Process	Position Type	1.7530	2	.8765	2.07	.1417
	Error (within)		33			
Product	Position Type	1.1925	2	.5962	1.34	.2754
	Error (within)		33			

* $p < .05$

Post-Hoc Comparisons

For the part-time employees, the source of variance on the input criterion category was further investigated by contrasting the three position levels using the Tukey-Kramer Modification of the HSD (honestly significant difference) test for post-hoc comparisons (Kirk, 1982). The Tukey-Kramer procedure was utilized because of unequal sample size. The results for this test indicated that the critical difference a pairwise comparison must exceed to be considered significant is .6499 Table 7 displays the contrasts of mean differences among part-time administrators, faculty and, career service employees. The findings suggest that

Table 7

Contrasts of Mean Differences Among Three Position Levels for Part-Time Status in the Input Criterion Category

	Levels Ordered by Size of Treatment Means		
Means	Administrators 1.7588	Faculty 2.0519	Career Service 2.4771
Administrators = 1.7588	____	.2931	.7183*
Faculty = 2.0519		____	.4252
Career Service = 2.4771			____

*Critical difference > .6499

the observed differences in the mean perceived importance ratings between part-time career service personnel and part-time administrators are statistically significant. Specifically, part-time administrators valued input criteria more than part-time career service employees. Other comparisons showed no significant difference.

Conclusions

The findings of a descriptive data analysis indicated that the majority of respondents reinforced the need and appropriateness of the criteria by rating each criterion no less than above average in importance. The percentage of items rated 1 or 2 (i.e., very important = 1, above average importance = 2) was higher in the context category than the other CIPP categories. Minimum and maximum responses were spread sufficiently on each item to reduce the possibility of a halo effect (see Table 2).

The descriptive analysis, additionally, indicated that each criterion had a greater positive relationship to the category in which it was placed than to any other category. Pearson-product moment correlations were substantially higher in the context area than the other criterion categories. In addition, respondents valued context criteria involving planning-type decisions more than criteria concerning procedural designs, implementation, or outcomes. The results suggest that the context category has commonly accepted means for influencing decisions concerning the

selection of goals and objectives. Whereas, the means for influencing decisions in the other CIPP categories are less clearly delineated. Although the reliability coefficients were high, they should be interpreted carefully since reliability is in part a function of the nature of the variables under consideration. The overall findings demonstrated that the CIPP model of evaluation served as an appropriate framework for grouping the criteria according to types of decisions.

The findings of a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) indicated a significant and sizable two-way interaction between position and status on the mean perceived importance ratings of the CIPP subscores considered as a vector of dependent variables. Multivariate tests of simple main effects were used to investigate the interaction. The observed results indicated a statistically significant position effect for part-time employees. No overall position effect was indicated for full-time employees. Upon further investigation of the perceptions among part-time employees, it was concluded that there is a difference in the mean perceived importance ratings among part-time administrators, faculty, and career service personnel in the Input criterion category. There was no significant difference in mean perceived importance ratings in the Context, Process and Product categories. Post-hoc comparisons indicated that the differences in perception between part-time administrators and part-time career service employees

in the input criterion category were statistically significant. The findings further suggested that there was no significant difference in the mean perceived importance ratings between part-time administrators vs. part-time faculty and part-time faculty vs. part-time career service employees.

Although the basis for the differences in perceptions between part-time administrators and part-time career service employees goes beyond the scope of this study, the reader is reminded that the differences are small. All items in the input criterion category were rated no less than above average in importance by the majority of respondents.

Discussion

The conclusions of this study concern the perceptions of community college staff members toward a set of staff development evaluative criteria which have been derived from the literature and validated by experts. In no way should these criteria be considered absolute. Their purpose is to provide a foundation for evaluation as determined by an institution's individual needs. Depending upon the type of decision making to be served: planning (Context), structuring (Input), implementing (Process), or recycling (Product), these criteria have been considered appropriate by multiple decision making sources.

In an attempt to identify appropriate evaluative criteria for a community college staff development program, an institution may choose either to develop criteria using its own research methodology or to utilize the validated criteria of this study as the basis for a thorough evaluation. Since these criteria have been assessed by multiple sources at the local, state and national level, their use can assist an institution by providing both direction and a basis for judgment.

The key to understanding how these criteria can best be utilized is to consider them in categories for serving four different types of evaluation according to the Stufflebeam CIPP model. The criteria were designed to look at selected decision areas. As a result, consideration should be given to defining the purpose of an evaluation before these criteria are ever used. Context criteria are designed to serve planning decisions. These criteria are utilized when a staff development program seeks information concerning the development or modification of goals and objectives. Needs are assessed and discrepancies between program intentions and actualities are diagnosed. Input criteria serve decisions concerning procedural designs. They provide information regarding alternative designs, strategies, and procedures resulting from planning decisions. When it is important to know if a staff development program is being conducted as intended, Process criteria are utilized. They provide information for monitoring a previously chosen

strategy or procedure to determine existing or potential defects. Data are generated and records are maintained. Recycling decisions are served by Product criteria. A staff development program would utilize these criteria when information is needed concerning the extent to which objectives have been met either at the end or at any point in the program cycle. Judgments are made concerning the continuation, modification, and termination of the total program or its components.

Inherent in the Stufflebeam model is the non-independent nature of the CIPP categories. A considerable overlap of information needs exist among the four different evaluations. Regardless, the CIPP model can be used effectively in focusing an evaluation effort toward the needed decision areas.

As recommended in the literature, these criteria were assessed by multiple decision-making sources. The fact that the majority of respondents from selected program publics at the institutional level demonstrated consensus with the experts on the perceived importance of each criterion reaffirms both the need for these criteria and their appropriateness. Moreover, the findings suggest that selected publics can be utilized successfully in determining a staff development program's standards for evaluation. The meaningful involvement of staff in the evaluation process promotes a sense of trust, awareness, and commitment.

The study also revealed that part-time employees, specifically, administrators and career service personnel, had a low response rate to the questionnaire. Together with part-time faculty, they were served minimally by the staff development program at Florida Junior College (D. Dumbleton, personal communication, March 23, 1984). This general lack of involvement may provide a reason for the differences in perceptions between part-time administrators and part-time career service personnel in the Input criterion category. Since Input evaluation deals with strategies, designs and procedures, perceptions could vary among employees lacking experience with these program concepts. Although differences in perception did exist, they were considered to be minimal. Each criterion in the Input criterion category was rated no less than above average in importance by a majority of respondents.

Recommendations

1. Immediate efforts are needed to provide a thorough evaluation of community college staff development programs.

2. These criteria should be utilized by institutions as a source of direction and a basis for judgment.

3. Program participants should be meaningfully involved in the evaluation process. For evaluative criteria to be trusted, they must be generated and assessed by multiple sources.

4. Training is needed in decision making evaluation methodology in order to maximize the information sources available to an institution.

5. The institutionalization of the program review process is needed to ensure that programs are not evaluated in a haphazard, piecemeal fashion.

Implications

The following implications may be derived as a result of this research:

1. These criteria are considered important by multiple decision making sources.

2. Evidence does not support the need for different criteria among selected program publics.

3. These criteria can be structured within the framework of the Context-Input-Process-Product decision making model of evaluation.

The results of this study indicate a need for research in the following areas:

1. The utilization of these criteria to evaluate community college staff development programs. Specifically, a comparison of highly visible versus moderately visible programs.

2. The determination of the extent to which state level organization and assistance is needed to operationalize the institutional evaluation of community college staff development programs.

3. A revision of the questionnaire to include a response category for the respondent to assign the type of decision that each criterion serves.

4. A replication of this study to involve other public community colleges.

5. A replication of this study using years of service as an independent variable.

6. A replication of this study in geographical areas dissimilar to Florida.

PART III

A PROCESS FOR UTILIZATION

The criteria identified in this study were structured into a framework according to the Stufflebeam CIPP model of evaluation. The following categories represent a major decision making area of a staff development program: planning (Context), procedural designs (Input), program implementation (Process), and outcomes (Product). Each criterion category is distinct. After the purpose of the evaluation has been determined, a particular criterion category can guide management toward a selected decision making area.

Context Evaluation

Criteria in the planning category (context evaluation) are designed to look at a program's intended ends. They provide a basis for judgment in the following ways:

- ASSESSMENT OF NEEDS
- ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENT
- DIAGNOSIS OF INHIBITORS OF NEEDS
- DETERMINATION OF GOALS TO BE SOUGHT
- DETERMINATION OF OBJECTIVES TO BE ACHIEVED
- IDENTIFICATION OF OPPORTUNITIES
- IDENTIFICATION OF STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES
- ASSESSMENT OF OVER-ALL STATUS
- DETERMINATION AS TO WHETHER GOALS AND PRIORITIES ARE ATTUNED TO NEEDS

CONTEXT CRITERIA

Planning (Mission/Goals/Needs) What, for whom?

1. The staff development program has a clearly written statement of mission.

2. The staff development program goals are in accordance to the over-all mission of the institution.

   A. Goals are well-defined and clearly specified.

   B. Goals are formulated through needs assessment procedures.

3. Objectives are written in a manner which permit measurement.

4. The staff development program has a commitment of administrative support.

5. The staff development program has the demonstrated acceptance of a majority of the staff.

6. The staff development program is assessed regularly with special reference to strengths and weaknesses.

7. The staff development program provides a variety of activities including those general to all staff and those specific to major program publics (e.g., administrators, faculty, career personnel).

Input Evaluation

Criteria in the Input category are designed to look at a program's intended means. These criteria provide a basis for judgment in the following ways:

- UTILIZATION OF RESOURCES
- IDENTIFICATION OF RELEVANT APPROACHES AND STRATEGIES
- ASSESSMENT OF EXISTING AND ALTERNATIVE STRATEGIES
- ANALYSIS OF LITERATURE
- EMPLOYMENT OF CONSULTANTS

INPUT CRITERIA

Procedural Designs (Structure/Strategy/Work Plan)
How, who will do it?

8. The staff development program is structured college-wide not departmentally.

9. The rationale for the staff development program is developmental in nature rather than remedial. The focus is on the promotion of growth rather than the correction of deficiencies.

10. The staff development program activities are designed to correspond with identified job competencies.

11. The content of each staff development activity is congruent with over-all program goals.

12. The staff development program has the following components: Instructional development (includes program development), personal development, professional development, and organizational development.

13. The staff development program has a clearly defined organizational structure.

    A. A coordinator is assigned the responsibility for program facilitation.

    B. The coordinator has a clearly defined job description.

C. The program staff possess a level of educational training or experience comparable to those served by the program.

D. An advisory committee representative of the college staff is actively involved in planning, implementing and evaluating the program.

14. The staff development program investigates a variety of information sources to assist decision making such as: an analysis of the literature, the employment of consultants, and visitations to exemplary programs.

15. Relevant strategies for meeting goals are accurately assessed within the content of identified needs.

16. Incentives are clearly defined and provided to program participants.

17. College-wide staff development practices provide:

A. Sabbatical leave at a minimum of half salary for one year for both faculty and administrators.

B. Leave without pay for educational or developmental purposes.

C. Travel funds for professional conferences.

D. Summer grants for new program development or existing course improvement (e.g., designing self-instructional modules).

Process Evaluation

Criteria in the Process category are designed to look at a program's actual means. They provide a basis for judgment in the following ways:

- DESCRIBING ACTUAL PROCESS
- IDENTIFYING STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES IN PROCEDURES
- DETERMINING WHETHER ACTIVITIES ARE ON SCHEDULE, CARRIED OUT AS PLANNED, AND UTILIZING AVAILABLE RESOURCES IN AN EFFICIENT MANNER.
- PROVIDING AN EXTENSIVE RECORD OF THE PROGRAM INCLUDING COSTS.
- ASSESSING HOW OBSERVERS AND PARTICIPANTS JUDGED THE QUALITY OF THE EFFORT

PROCESS CRITERIA

Program Implementation (Actual Implementation/ Process)

18. Staff development activities are appropriate to the levels and abilities of the participants.

19. Staff are provided opportunities to visit other departments in the college or other institutions to review educational programs or innovative projects.

20. The staff development program is funded between two to five percent of the regular operating budget of the institution.

21. Separate budgets exist for a) the administration of the staff development office and b) the implementation of staff development projects.

22. The program is monitored regularly to assure that activities are on schedule, carried out as planned, and use available resources in an efficient manner.

23. An extensive record of the program exists and includes: how the program compared to what was intended, expenditures, and participant reaction.

    A. Participants are counted and recorded.

    B. Activities have an evaluation component which provides a regular assessment of current operations.

24. Instructional Development Activities Provide:

    A. Training in the latest instructional trends.

    B. Training in the development of course objectives and course design.

    C. Training in remedial and development techniques of instruction.

    D. Training in self-instructional methods.

    E. Training in multi-media approaches to instruction.

    F. Training in the evaluation of instructional strategies.

25. Personal Development Activities Provide:

    A. Interpersonal skills training.

    B. Training in personal growth and development.

    C. Professional growth contracts.

    D. Opportunities for individual counseling.

    E. Training in health awareness.

26. Professional Development Activities Provide:

    A. Training in the psychology of learning.

    B. Training in student developmental needs.

    C. Training in nontraditional studies and delivery systems.

27. Organizational Development Activities Provide:

    A. Training in planning and decision making.

    B. Training in management skills including efficiency techniques such as: PPBS, MIS, MBO, etc.

    C. Training in faculty, administrator and student assessment techniques.

    D. Training in team building.

    E. Training in conflict management.

Product Evaluation

Criteria in the Product Category are designed to look at a program's actual outcomes. They provide a basis for judgment in the following ways:

- DEVELOPING INSTRUMENTS TO ASSESS ATTAINMENTS OF PROGRAM OBJECTIVES
- COLLECTING AND ANALYZING DATA
- ASCERTAINING THE EXTENT TO WHICH NEEDS HAVE BEEN MET
- LOOKING BROADLY AT INTENDED AND UNINTENDED PROGRAM EFFECTS
- GATHERING AND ANALYZING JUDGMENTS OF PROGRAM SUCCESS DURING PROGRAM AND/OR AT ITS CONCLUSION

PRODUCT CRITERIA

Outcomes

28. The effectiveness of the staff development program is determined through:

    A. Surveying participant reaction.

    B. Determining changes in participants.

    C. Assessing changes in student development, curriculum and institutional processes.

29. An evaluation plan exists which measures and interprets the attainments of program goals and objectives.

    A. The design includes the development of instrumentation, data collection, and data analysis.

    B. Program effects both intended and unintended are assessed during the program and at its conclusion.

    C. Results are reported in a manner that can be easily interpreted.

30. Program activities and operations are cost-effective in relation to goals and purposes.

31. Instructional development efforts demonstrate a positive effect college-wide by:

    A. The increased knowledge and utilization of remedial and developmental techniques.

    B. The increased knowledge and utilization of self-instructional methods.

    C. The increased knowledge and utilization of multi-media approaches to instruction.

    D. The increased knowledge and utilization of current educational methodologies and technologies.

E. The increased knowledge and utilization of course objectives and course outlines.

F. The increased knowledge and utilization of instructional evaluation techniques.

G. The increased knowledge and development of new programs.

32. Personal development efforts have a positive effect college-wide by:

A. The improvement of interpersonal skills.

B. The enhancement of confidence and self-worth.

C. The commitment toward personal growth and renewal.

33. Professional development efforts have a positive effect college-wide by:

A. The increased knowledge and understanding of the psychology of learning.

B. The increased knowledge and understanding of student needs, interests, and background.

C. The increased knowledge and understanding of non-traditional studies and delivery systems.

D. The increased peer interactions among staff.

E. The upgrading of job competencies.

34. Organizational development efforts have a positive effect college-wide by:

A. The improvement of communication skills.

B. The improvement of staff morale.

C. The involvement of staff in planning and decision making.

D. The increased understanding of institutional goals and processes.

E. The increased knowledge and utilization of current management skills and efficiency techniques.

F. The increased understanding and responsiveness toward change.

APPENDIX A

STUDY COVER LETTER

AND QUESTIONNAIRE

51/52

FLORIDA JUNIOR COLLEGE AT JACKSONVILLE
COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION
501 WEST STATE STREET
JACKSONVILLE, FLORIDA 32202
(904) 632-3000

January 30, 1984

Dear Colleague,

You have been selected in a random sample of Florida Junior College staff to participate in an important research study by the University of Florida's Institute of Higher Education. The purpose of this study is to develop a process for the evaluation of community college staff development programs. Since Florida Junior College has been selected as the pilot institution, your cooperation is critical to the success of the research effort.

Staff development evaluative criteria have been developed by Shirley Hekimian, and validated by a special Task Force of the Florida Association of Staff and Program Development and a national panel of experts. Ms. Hekimian, a Ph.D. candidate has worked as an administrative intern with Dr. Ferguson for the past four months, and has assisted in the development of a program review and management training process. This study involving staff development evaluation completes her work at Florida Junior College.

Your role in the study is to carefully assess each criterion and determine whether it should be used as a standard for evaluation. You are judging the criteria not the program. Once derived, the criteria will provide a standard of comparison from which we can determine the effectiveness of our staff development efforts.

The enclosed instrument lists the criteria. You are asked to respond according to a five point scale where one indicates that a criterion is very important and five indicates that a criterion is unimportant.

Thank you for your time and consideration. Please return the completed instrument by Friday, February 3rd.

Sincerely yours,

D. Dumbleton

Dr. Duane Dumbleton
Director, Staff and
Program Development

DD/sh

An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action College in Education and Employment

STAFF DEVELOPMENT EVALUATIVE CRITERIA

Directions: The following are criteria that may be used in the institutional evaluation of a staff development program. Criteria assist an evaluation team or committee by providing a standard from which a judgement can be based. After considering each criterion, place an (X) in the space provided indicating the degree of importance that you place on each criterion based upon a five point scale. One indicates that the criterion is very important and five indicates that the criterion is unimportant. Please remember that you are assessing the criteria and not the program.

Return to: Ms. Shirley Hekimian
Department of Staff and
Program Development
CAB

STAFF DEVELOPMENT EVALUATIVE CRITERIA

CRITERIA	Very Important 1	Above Average Importance 2	Average Importance 3	Below Average Importance 4	Unimportant 5	(Please do not mark in this space)
Planning (Mission/Goals/Needs) What, for whom?)						1-3
						5
						7
1. The staff development program has a clearly written statement of mission.	___	___	___	___	___	10
2. The staff development program goals are in accordance to the over-all mission of the institution.	___	___	___	___	___	11
A. Goals are well-defined and clearly specified.	___	___	___	___	___	12
B. Goals are formulated through needs assessment procedures.	___	___	___	___	___	13
3. Objectives are written in a manner which permit measurement.	___	___	___	___	___	14
4. The staff development program has a commitment of administrative support.	___	___	___	___	___	15
5. The staff development program has the demonstrated acceptance of a majority of the staff.	___	___	___	___	___	16
6. The staff development program is assessed regularly with special reference to strengths and weaknesses.	___	___	___	___	___	17
7. The staff development program provides a variety of activities including those general to all staff and those specific to major program publics (e.g., administrators, faculty, career personnel).	___	___	___	___	___	18
Procedural Designs (Structure/Strategy/Work Plan) How, who will do it?						
8. The staff development program is structured college-wide not departmentally.	___	___	___	___	___	19
9. The rationale for the staff development program is developmental in nature rather than remedial. The focus is on the promotion of growth rather than the correction of deficiencies.	___	___	___	___	___	20
10. The staff development program activities are designed to correspond with identified job competencies.	___	___	___	___	___	21
11. The content of each staff development activity is congruent with over-all program goals.	___	___	___	___	___	22

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CRITERIA	Very Important 1	Above Average Importance 2	Average Importance 3	Below Average Importance 4	Unimportant 5	(Please do not mark in this space)
12. The staff development program has the following components: Instructional development (includes program development), personal development, professional development, and organizational development.	___	___	___	___	___	23
13. The staff development program has a clearly defined organizational structure.	___	___	___	___	___	24
A. A coordinator is assigned the responsibility for program facilitation.	___	___	___	___	___	25
B. The coordinator has a clearly defined job description.	___	___	___	___	___	26
C. The program staff possess a level of educational training or experience comparable to those served by the program.	___	___	___	___	___	27
D. An advisory committee representative of the college staff is actively involved in planning, implementing and evaluating the program.	___	___	___	___	___	28
14. The staff development program investigates a variety of information sources to assist decision making such as: an analysis of the literature, the employment of consultants, and visitations to exemplary programs.	___	___	___	___	___	29
15. Relevant strategies for meeting goals are accurately assessed within the content of identified needs.	___	___	___	___	___	30
16. Incentives are clearly defined and provided to program participants.	___	___	___	___	___	31
17. College-wide staff development practices provide:						
A. Sabbatical leave at a minimum of half salary for one year for both faculty and administrators.	___	___	___	___	___	32
B. Leave without pay for educational or developmental purposes.	___	___	___	___	___	33
C. Travel funds for professional conferences.	___	___	___	___	___	34
D. Summer grants for new program development or existing course improvement (e.g., designing self-instructional modules).	___	___	___	___	___	35

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CRITERIA	Very Important 1	Above Average Importance 2	Average Importance 3	Below Average Importance 4	Unimportant 5	(Please do not mark in this space)
Program Implementation (Actual Implementation/Process)						
18. Staff development activities are appropriate to the levels and abilities of the participants.	___	___	___	___	___	36
19. Staff are provided opportunities to visit other departments in the color other institutions to review educational programs or innovative projects.	___	___	___	___	___	37
20. The staff development program is funded between two to five percent of the regular operating budget of the institution.	___	___	___	___	___	38
21. Separate budgets exist for a) the administration of the staff development office and b) the implementation of staff development projects.	___	___	___	___	___	39
22. The program is monitored regularly to assure that activities are on schedule, carried out as planned, and use available resources in an efficient manner.	___	___	___	___	___	40
23. An extensive record of the program exists and includes: how the program compared to what was intended, expenditures, and participant reaction.	___	___	___	___	___	41
A. Participants are counted and recorded.	___	___	___	___	___	42
B. Activities have an evaluation component which provides a regular assessment of current operations.	___	___	___	___	___	43
24. Instructional Development Activities Provide:						
A. Training in the latest instructional trends.	___	___	___	___	___	44
B. Training in the development of course objectives and course design.	___	___	___	___	___	45
C. Training in remedial and development techniques of instruction.	___	___	___	___	___	46
D. Training in self-instructional methods.	___	___	___	___	___	47
E. Training in multi-media approaches to instruction.	___	___	___	___	___	48
F. Training in the evaluation of instructional strategies.	___	___	___	___	___	49

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CRITERIA	Very Important 1	Above Average Importance 2	Average Importance 3	Below Average Importance 4	Unimportant 5	(Please do not mark in this space)
25. Personal Development Activities Provide:						
A. Interpersonal skills training.	____	____	____	____	____	50
B. Training in personal growth and development.	____	____	____	____	____	51
C. Professional growth contracts.	____	____	____	____	____	52
D. Opportunities for individual counseling.	____	____	____	____	____	53
E. Training in health awareness.	____	____	____	____	____	54
26. Professional Development Activities Provide:						
A. Training in the psychology of learning.	____	____	____	____	____	55
B. Training in student developmental needs.	____	____	____	____	____	56
C. Training in nontraditional studies and delivery systems.	____	____	____	____	____	57
27. Organizational Development Activities Provide:						
A. Training in planning and decision-making.	____	____	____	____	____	58
B. Training in management skills including efficiency techniques such as: PPBS, MIS, MBO, etc.	____	____	____	____	____	59
C. Training in faculty, administrator and student assessment techniques.	____	____	____	____	____	60
D. Training in team building.	____	____	____	____	____	61
E. Training in conflict management.	____	____	____	____	____	62
Outcomes						
28. The effectiveness of the staff development program is determined through:						
A. Surveying participant reaction.	____	____	____	____	____	63
B. Determining changes in participants.	____	____	____	____	____	64
C. Assessing changes in student development, curriculum and institutional processes.	____	____	____	____	____	65

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CRITERIA	Very Important 1	Above Average Importance 2	Average Importance 3	Below Average Importance 4	Unimportant 5	(Please do not mark in this space)
29. An evaluation plan exists which measures and interprets the attainments of program goals and objectives.	____	____	____	____	____	66
A. The design includes the development of instrumentation, data collection, and data analysis.	____	____	____	____	____	67
B. Program effects both intended and unintended are assessed during the program and at its conclusion.	____	____	____	____	____	68
C. Results are reported in a manner that can be easily interpreted.	____	____	____	____	____	69
30. Program activities and operations are cost-effective in relation to goals and purposes.	____	____	____	____	____	70
31. Instructional development efforts demonstrate a positive effect college-wide by:						
A. The increased knowledge and utilization of remedial and developmental techniques.	____	____	____	____	____	71
B. The increased knowledge and utilization of self-instructional methods.	____	____	____	____	____	72
C. The increased knowledge and utilization of multi-media approaches to instruction.	____	____	____	____	____	73
D. The increased knowledge and utilization of current educational methodologies and technologies.	____	____	____	____	____	74
E. The increased knowledge and utilization of course objectives and course outlines.	____	____	____	____	____	75
F. The increased knowledge and utilization of instructional evaluation techniques.	____	____	____	____	____	76
G. The increased knowledge and development of new programs.	____	____	____	____	____	77
32. Personal development efforts have a positive effect college-wide by:						
A. The improvement of interpersonal skills.	____	____	____	____	____	78
B. The enhancement of confidence and self-worth.	____	____	____	____	____	79
C. The commitment toward personal growth and renewal.	____	____	____	____	____	80

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CRITERIA	Very Important 1	Above Average Importance 2	Average Importance 3	Below Average Importance 4	Unimportant 5	(Please do not mark in this space)
33. Professional development efforts have a positive effect college-wide by:						
A. The increased knowledge and understanding of the psychology of learning.	____	____	____	____	____	10
B. The increased knowledge and understanding of student needs, interests, and background.	____	____	____	____	____	11
C. The increased knowledge and understanding of non-traditional studies and delivery systems.	____	____	____	____	____	12
D. The increased peer interactions among staff.	____	____	____	____	____	13
E. The upgrading of job competencies.	____	____	____	____	____	14
34. Organizational development efforts have a positive effect college-wide by:						
A. The improvement of communication skills.	____	____	____	____	____	15
B. The improvement of staff morale.	____	____	____	____	____	16
C. The involvement of staff in planning and decision making.	____	____	____	____	____	17
D. The increased understanding of institutional goals and processes.	____	____	____	____	____	18
E. The increased knowledge and utilization of current management skills and efficiency techniques.	____	____	____	____	____	19
F. The increased understanding and responsiveness toward change.	____	____	____	____	____	20

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

REFERENCES

Alden, J. (1978). Evaluation in focus. Training and Development Journal, 10(32), 46-50.

Barak, R. J. (1982). Program review in higher education: Within and without. Boulder, CO: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems.

Bergquist, W. H., & Phillips, S. R. (1977). A handbook for faculty development (Vol. 2). Washington, DC: Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges.

Case, C. (1978). Staff development for the community college. In J. Lindquist (Ed.), Designing teaching improvement programs (pp. 130-162). Berkeley, CA: Pacific Soundings Press.

Centra, J. (1976). Faculty development practices in U. S. colleges and universities. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Cronbach, L. J. (1982). Designing evaluations of educational and social programs. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Day, R. W., & Bender, L. W. (1976). The state role in program evaluation of community colleges: Emerging concepts and trends. Tallahassee, FL: Florida State University, State and Regional Higher Education Center. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 126 982)

Department of Education. (1968). State Board of Education regulations. Tallahassee, FL: Department of Education

Department of Education. (1977). Staff and program development in Florida's community colleges 1975-76. Tallahassee, FL: Department of Education.

Department of Education. (1980). Staff and program development in Florida's community colleges 1979-80. Tallahassee, FL: Department of Education.

Department of Education. (1982). Community college rule change. Tallahassee, FL: Division of Community Colleges.

Division of Community Colleges. (1968). President's Council Committee of 1968. Tallahassee, FL: Division of Colleges.

Engdahl, L., & Barak, R. (1980). Study of academic program review. In B. Krauth (Ed.), Postsecondary education program review: Report of a WICHE-NCHEMS workshop and study. Boulder, CO: National Center for Higher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 184 486)

Fincher, C. (1978). Importance of criteria for institutional goals. In R. Fenske (Ed.), New directions for institutional research and planning: No. 19. Using goals in research and planning (pp. 1-15). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gaff, J. G., & Justice, D. (1978). Faculty development yesterday, today and tomorrow. In J. G. Gaff (Ed.), New directions for higher education: No. 24. Institutional renewal through the improvement of teaching (pp. 85-98). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Griffin, G. A. (1978). Guidelines for the evaluation of staff development programs. Teachers College Record, 80 (1), 126-139.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1981). Effective evaluation: Improving the usefulness of evaluation results through responsive and naturalistic approaches. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Harris, B. M. (1980). Improving staff performance through in-service education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Inservice. (1981). Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University, National Council of State on Inservice Education.

Jalbert, E. L. (1980). Staff development in institutions of higher education. In W. R. Houston, & R. Pankratz (Eds.), Staff development and educational change (pp. 53-60). Washington, DC: Association of Teacher Educators. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. 193 227)

Keppel, G. (1982). Design and analysis a researcher's handbook (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Kirk, R. (1968). Experimental design: Procedures for the behavioral sciences. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

O'Banion, T. (1972). Teachers for tomorrow: Staff development in the community-junior college. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press.

O'Banion, T. (1978). Organizing staff development programs that work. Washington, DC: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

Official Florida Statutes (13th ed.). (1971). Tallahassee, FL: Joint Legislative Management Committee.

Petrie, H. (1982). Program evaluation as an adaptive system. In M. Kramer (Ed.), New direction for higher education: No. 37. Designing academic program reviews (pp. 17-29). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Smith, A. (1977). Evaluating staff development programs. In T. O'Banion (Ed.), New directions for community colleges: No. 19. Developing staff potential (pp. 91-101). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Smith, A. (1980). National research project on the status of staff, program and organizational development in community colleges. Ankeny, IA: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges National Council for Staff, Program and Organizational Development.

Steele, S. (1970). The criteria problem in program evaluation. Paper presented at the Adult Education Research Conference, Minneapolis, MN. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. ED 036 748)

Stufflebeam, D., Foley, W., Gephart, W., Guba, E., Hammond, R., Merriman, H., & Provus, M. (1971). Educational evaluation and decision making. Itasca, IL: F. E. Peacock.

Terrell, R. (1978). History of the Florida Association for Staff and Program Development. Jacksonville, FL: Florida Association for Staff and Program Development.

Watts, G. E., & Hammons, J. (1980). Staff development: A time for appraisal. Washington, DC: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

Wergin, J. F. (1977). Evaluating faculty development programs. In J. Centra (Ed.), New directions for higher education: No. 17. Renewing and evaluating teaching (pp. 57-76). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Yarrington, R. (Ed.). (1974). Educational opportunity for all: New staff for new students. Washington, DC: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
8118 Math-Sciences Building
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024

68 SEP 14 1984